DOCKET NO.: IVOO-0068 PATENT

Application No.: 09/781,679

Office Action Dated: April 18, 2006

## REMARKS

Acknowledgment of the Replacement drawings as formal submitted herewith are respectfully requested.

Claims 41-111 are pending in this application. Claims 54, 69, 79, 93, 99, and 107 are canceled herein without prejudice.

In summary of the outstanding Office Action, Claims 41-56, 59-76, 79-84, 98-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ginter (US Pre Grant Pub. 20040054630).

Claims 50 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pre Grant Pub. 2004/0054630) in view of Knight (US Pat. 6,243,350).

Claims 57, 77 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pre Grant Pub. 2004/0054630) in view of Yuen et al. (US Pat. 6,147,715).

Claims 58, 78, and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pre Grant Pub. 2004/0054630) in view of Yuen et al. (US Pat. 6,147,715) an as applied to claim 57 and 96 above, and further in view of Ward et al. (US Pre Grant Pub. 2005/0010949).

Reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections to the claims is respectfully requested in view of the present amendments and following remarks.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank Examiner and Examiner's supervisor for their time and consideration during the previous interview and Applicants provide the present reply to the outstanding Office Action in light of the discussions had during the interview.

## Rejection of Independent Claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108

Claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ginter (US Pre Grant Pub. 20040054630).

Claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108 have been amended herein to include the limitations substantially corresponding to those of canceled claims 54, 69, 79, 93, 99, and 107 (which were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ginter). Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and arguments supporting the rejections of claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108 in the Office Action prior to the amendments herein,

**DOCKET NO.:** IVOO-0068 **Application No.:** 09/781,679

Office Action Dated: April 18, 2006

Applicants submit Ginter does not disclose the subject matter of the claims as amended. The Office Action states that "Ginter discloses that the recorded data includes a multitude of data frames having a specified security code (i.e., rules and controls security code) and the specified processor only outputs data frames having the specified security code. See [0414]." First, the "rules and controls" described in Ginter is not a security code, but is "control information" that indicates what, how and by whom content may be used:

For example, the "rules and controls" shown in FIG. 2 may grant specific individuals or classes of content users 112 "permission" to use certain content. They may specify what kinds of content usage are permitted, and what kinds are not. They may specify how content usage is to be paid for and how much it costs. As another example, "rules and controls" may require content usage information to be reported back to the distributor 106 and/or content creator 102.

Ginter, ¶ 0391.

Thus, Ginter does not describe recorded data "that includes a multitude of data frames having a specified security code."

Second, Ginter does not describe "providing a processor for the remote viewing location that only outputs data frames having said specified security code." The "electronic containers" described in Ginter in ¶ 0414 (to which the Office Action cites) are not described as being output by a processor at the remote location. As described in Ginter, these "electronic containers" are containers for the *content* that may be accessed and output at a user location, and thus are not output themselves:

Container 302 may contain information content 304 in electronic (such as "digital") form. Information content 304 could be the text of a novel, a picture, sound such as a musical performance or a reading, a movie or other video, computer software, or just about any other kind of electronic information you can think of. Other types of "objects" 300 (such as "administrative objects") may contain "administrative" or other information instead of or in addition to information content 304.

In the FIG. 5A example, container 302 may also contain "rules and controls" in the form of:

(a) a "permissions record" 808;

**PATENT** 

**DOCKET NO.:** IVOO-0068 **Application No.:** 09/781,679

Office Action Dated: April 18, 2006

- (b) "budgets" 308; and
- (c) "other methods" 1000.

Ginter, ¶ 0416-0420

Thus, for at least the reasons above, Applicants submit that all the limitations of claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108 are not taught or suggested by Ginter.

## Rejection of the Pending Dependent Claims

The remaining dependent claims either depend directly or indirectly from claims 41, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 108 or were rejected under the same rationale. Thus, Applicants submit that all the limitations of these claims are not taught or suggested by Ginter, any of the other references cited by the Office Action, or any combination thereof, for at least the same reasons presented above. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 41-53, 55-68, 70-78, 80-92, 94-98, and 100-107 of the application are in condition for allowance.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the present reply is responsive to each point raised by the Examiner in the Office Action and Applicants submit that claims 41-53, 55-68, 70-78, 80-92, 94-98, and 100-107 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited. However, should the Examiner find the claims as presented herein to not be allowable for any reason, Applicants' undersigned representative earnestly requests a telephone conference at (206) 332-1392 with both the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor to discuss the basis for the Examiner's continued rejection in light of the Applicant's arguments presented herein. Likewise, should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions that would expedite the prosecution of the present case to allowance, Applicants' undersigned representative would very much appreciate a telephone conference to discuss these issues.

Date: July 12, 2006

Michael D. Stein

Registration No. 34,734

Woodcock Washburn LLP One Liberty Place - 46th Floor Philadelphia PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 568-3100

Facsimile: (215) 568-3439